## PD-1015-18 **COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS** AUSTIN, TEXAS BODKIN | NIEHAUS | DORRIS | JOLLEY PLLC

mitted 3/11/2019 4:39 PM Accepted 3/12/2019 1:04 PM Appellate | Business | Estate Planning Tax | Regulatory | White Collar

Attorneys and Counselors

Monday, March 11, 2019

**FILED** COURT OF CRIMINAL APPEALS 3/12/2019 DEANA WILLIAMSON, CLERK

**DEANA WILLIAMSON** 

SCOTT BODKIN SCOTT@BNDJLEGAL.COM

**JASON EDWARD NIEHAUS** JASON@BNDJLEGAL.COM

MARGO DORRIS MARGO@BNDJLEGAL.COM

R. RENEE JOLLEY RENEE@BNDJLEGAL.COM

Flower Mound Office 6021 Morriss Rd., Ste. 111 Flower Mound, TX 75028 Phone: (972) 704-1368 Fax: (888) 314-7695

Denton Office 207 W. Hickory St., Ste. 309 Denton, TX 76201 Phone: (940) 600-1295 Fax: (888) 314-7695

Dallas Office 10440 N. Central Expv, Ste. 800 Dallas, TX 75231 Phone: (214) 540-7999 Fax: (888) 314-7695

BY APPOINTMENT ONLY

Deana Williamson Clerk of the Court Texas Court of Criminal Appeals 201 West 14th St, Room 106 Austin, Texas 78701

RE: Ralph D. Watkins v. State of Texas, PD-1015-18

Dear Ms. Williamson:

On March 7, 2019, the State filed post-submission letter brief following oral argument on February 20, 2019. This letter serves as my response.

The State simultaneously takes the position that the Michael Morton Act did not change the law, and that the Act overturned almost sixty years of *Brady* precedent. This conflicts with the State Prosecuting Attorney's office. See Br. of Amicus State Prosecuting Attorney at 9 (Urging court to continue using Brady as metric). Of course, that brief is in direct conflict with the brief the State Prosecuting Attorney's office filed in the 10<sup>th</sup> Court of Appeals. Compare Br. of Amicus State Prosecuting Attorney at 8 - 13 (*Brady* incorporated into act, urging reliance on stare decisis) with Br. of St. Pros. Atty. at 10 - 20, Watkins v. State, 554 S.W.3d 819 (Tex. App – Waco 2018)(No. 10-16-00377-CR) located at ROA<sup>1</sup> 1281 - 1292)(Act is not a codification of *Brady*).

Disregarding sixty years of Brady precedent is both unnecessary to disposition of this case and, to the extent that it would create unnecessary discrepancies with multiple United States Supreme Court decisions, unwise. Counsel stands by his proposed interpretation in his opening merits brief and waives further response.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ J. Edward Niehaus **Jason Edward Niehaus** 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> ROA is Record On Appeal, the consolidated record in this Court

Bodkin, Niehaus, Dorris & Jolley, PLLC 207 W. Hickory St. Suite 309 Denton, Texas 76201 PHONE: (972) 704-1368

FAX: (888) 314-7695 JASON@BNDJLEGAL.COM

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

This is to certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing letter regarding response to the State's post-submission briefing was served upon the attorney for the State, the State Prosecuting Attorney's Office, and TDCLA via electronic filing on Monday, March 11, 2019

/s/ J. Edward Niehaus Jason Edward Niehaus